	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	10/723,755	STOBIE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Zheng Wei	2192	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *Tuan Q. Dam*.   (3)*Jens C. Jenkins (Reg#:44803)*.

(2) *Zheng Wei*.   (4)_____.

Date of Interview: *05 February 2008*.

Type: a)☐ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
        c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant   2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☒ No.
   If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: *15-17,42-44* .

Identification of prior art discussed: *Johnson et al.*.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached.   g)☒ was not reached.   h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *See Continuation Sheet*.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

(1)   The Applicant clarified the main invention of current application and addressed the difference to the prior art Johnson.

(2)   The Applicant presented the proposed amendment claims to further indicate the difference between the first verification level and second level.

(3)   The Examiner pointed out that some terms used in the proposed claims may raise 35 U.S.C. § 112 issues regarding "insert record object" for different verification levels as cited in claims 17, 42-44

(4)   The Examiner is waiting for the official amendment for further prosecution.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	10/723,755	STOBIE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Zheng Wei	2192	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *Tuan Q. Dam.*

(3) *Jens C. Jenkins (Reg#:44803).*

(2) *Zheng Wei.*

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: *05 February 2008*.

Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference
c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: *15-17,42-44* .

Identification of prior art discussed: *Johnson et al.*.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☒ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *See Continuation Sheet*.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

_____
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

(1)   The Applicant clarified the main invention of current application and addressed the difference to the prior art Johnson.

(2)   The Applicant presented the proposed amendment claims to further indicate the difference between the first verification level and second level.

(3)   The Examiner pointed out that some terms used in the proposed claims may raise 35 U.S.C. § 112 issues regarding "insert record object" for different verification levels as cited in claims 17, 42-44

(4)   The Examiner is waiting for the official amendment for further prosecution.

DYNAMICALLY TUNABLE SOFTWARE TEST
Serial No.: 10/723,755
Docket No.: 13768.459
Examiner: Zheng Wei
Interview Date/Time: February 5, 2008 @ 10:30 AM

17/25.   (Previously Presented) In a computer system that includes software under test, a method of verifying the software with one or more tunable test cases that are capable of being set to any of a plurality of verification levels, the method comprising steps for:

loading one or more test cases that include a plurality of software testing instructions organized as a plurality of verification levels within a verification hierarchy, wherein at least two verification levels within the verification hierarchy define different amounts of testing to perform for determining if the software functions as intended when executed;

receiving verification setting instructions for one or more desired verification levels from within the verification hierarchy for use in testing the software, wherein the received verification setting instructions select the one or more desired verification levels from a group of verification levels that include at least first and second verification levels, wherein selection of the first verification level causes the one or more test cases to be run during testing and which includes invoking an insert record object to determine if the invocation of the insert record object results in a system crash and while refraining from producing any recorded output, and wherein selection of the second verification level causes the one or more test cases to invoke an insert record object, and wherein the second verification level is distinguished from the first verification level by verifying with recorded output, which was produced by the second verification level and which the first verification level refrained from producing, that a record corresponding to the insert record object was properly inserted and present; and

testing the software at the one or more desired verification levels, which include at least one of the first and second verification levels, by running the one or more test cases that include the plurality of software testing instructions that correspond to the one or more desired verification levels.

> **Deleted:** and to additionally verify through recorded

42.   (Previously Presented)   A method as recited in claim 17, wherein selection of a third verification level causes verification of the record being inserted as well as verification that the record was only inserted a single time and wherein testing of the software includes running the third verification level.

43.   (Previously Presented)   A method as recited in claim 17, wherein selection of a third verification level causes verification of the record being inserted as well as verification that the record was inserted without overwriting another record and wherein testing of the software includes running the third verification level.

44.   (Currently Amended) A method as recited in claim 17, wherein the method further includes upon detecting an adverse or unexpected result from testing the software, isolating the plurality of test cases within the test group and running each of the isolated test cases individually.

> **Deleted:** determining which of the one or more test cases has caused the adverse or unexpected result, and wherein the determination of which of the test cases has caused the adverse or unexpected result is accomplished by

15.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 17, wherein a portion of the one or more test cases that corresponds to the one or more desired verification levels does not produce any testing output.

16.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 17, wherein a portion of the one or more test cases that corresponds to the one or more desired verification levels produces one or more test outputs for verifying the software.